



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*[Handwritten Signature]*  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/671,717	09/29/2003	Harry A. Dugger III	11122-037-999	2024
24998	7590	06/02/2006	EXAMINER	
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP 2101 L Street, NW Washington, DC 20037				HAGHIGHATIAN, MINA
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		1616		

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/671,717	DUGGER ET AL.
	Examiner Mina Haghigian	Art Unit 1616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 March 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-104 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 11-21,29-39,49-56,63-88 and 95-104 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-10,22-28,40-48,57-62 and 89-94 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/03, 3/05 &amp; 7/05</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Election/Restrictions***

Claims 1-10, 22-28, 40-48, 57-64, 79-80 and 89-96 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 03/03/06.

Also, claims 63-88 and 95-98 are withdrawn from examination as being drawn to a non-elected species. The elected species is "treating emesis".

**Note:** certain concentration ranges in the claims, such as "0.1 and 99.8", "1 and 95", "5 and 75", "0.5 and 4", etc, do not correspond to concentration ranges stated in the specification. It is the Applicant's responsibility to examine all concentration ranges stated in the claims and assure they correspond to the specification.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Physicians' Desk Reference, 1995.

Art Unit: 1616

Physicians' Desk Reference, 1995 discloses drug information on Zofran® injection, ondansetron hydrochloride injections for I.V. administration.. The formulations comprise ondansetron hydrochloride in water for injection/sodium chloride and/or Dextrose solution.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-10, 22-28 and 40-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deihl (WO 9413280) in view of Fassberg et al (EP 0656206A1) and further in view of Kanios et al (5,719,197) or alternatively in view of Physicians' Desk Reference, 1995.

Deihl teaches a **sprayable analgesic** composition comprising an analgesic compound which is absorbed into the bloodstream through the **buccal mucosa** and a pharmacologically acceptable liquid carrier. In a preferred embodiment the active agent is ibuprofen and the liquid carrier is **aqueous ethanol** (see page 3). The formulation may also contain other ingredients such as surfactants, humectants, **flavoring agents**, etc (see page 4). The table in example I shows the concentration ranges of each ingredient. Deihl fails to disclose other suitable active agents for the said formulation, or the use of other solvents including polyethylene glycol and non-polar solvent.

Fassberg discloses aerosol, formulations for oral or nasal administration, which comprise a medicament, an excipient, propellant and optionally surfactants. The suitable excipients include **alcohols, polyethylene glycols, short chain fatty acids**, etc (see page 3). Fassberg discloses that any pharmaceutically active agent which can be delivered by oral or nasal inhalation may be used. Examples include antihistamines, antiallergics, analgesics, antibiotics, steroids, bronchodilators, etc (see page 5, lines 42-50).

Kanios teaches compositions and methods for topical administration of pharmaceutically active agents. Topical administration means a direct contact of the formulation with tissue, such as skin or membrane, particularly the oral or **buccal mucosa** (col. 1, lines 29-59).

Kanios discloses that the composition comprises a therapeutically effective amount of at least one pharmaceutically **active agent**, a pharmaceutically acceptable **solvent** for the active agent (col. 2, lines 22-28). The solvent is preferably a polyhydric alcohol such as polypropylene glycol, ethylene glycol, also solvents including fatty acids such as oleic acid, as well as fatty esters or alcohols. The solvent is present in an amount from about 20 to 50 weight percent based on the total weight of the composition (col. 4, lines 1-49; col. 5, lines 24-66). The concentration of the solubilized active agent can range from **1 to 50%** by weight (col. 8, lines 1-9). The acceptable carrier is intended to be any suitable finite or non-finite carrier including liquids, semi-liquids or solid carriers. Thus the active agent may be admixed with carriers such as spray-solution or any non-finite carrier known in the art for delivery of active agents (col. 8, lines 54-67). Other additives may be incorporated into the formulations such as flavorings (col. 10, lines 48-56).

Kanios discloses that pharmaceutically active agents suitable for such formulation include galanthamine, lidocaine, mepivacaine, propofol, atracurium, ipratropium, amantadine, diazepam, pregabalin, primidone, clozapine, ondansetron, chlorpromazine, haloperidol, amitryptyline, buspirone, chlorzoxazone, cyclobenzaprine, interferon beta, estradiol, nimodipine, tacrine, carbidopa, acetylcholine, epinephrine, pergolide, doxepine, clomipramine, zolpidem, amphetamine, dextroamphetamine, methylphenidate, sumatriptan, pemoline, mazindol, desipramine, flumazenil, mesoridazine, etc (columns 13-31).

Physicians' Desk Reference teaches an ondansetron hydrochloride solution for injection used as an antiemetic.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made given the general teachings of formulations for buccal mucosal administration of Diehl, to have looked in the art for other specific solvents suitable for spray formulations of liquid carriers, as taught by Fassberg et al, with reasonable expectations of successfully preparing suitable formulations for various therapies. Furthermore it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have substituted any suitable active agent for the analgesics of Diehl's buccal spray formulations as claimed as taught by Kanios et al or Physicians' Desk Reference.

Claims 1-10, 22-28 and 40-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fu et al (WO 9303751) in view of Physicians' Desk Reference.

Fu teaches compositions and methods for the sublingual or buccal administration of therapeutic agents. The compositions comprise a therapeutic agent dissolved or dispersed in a carrier which comprises a solvent, an optional cosolvent, and an oral mucosal membrane transport enhancing agent. The solvent comprises from about 50% w/v to about 95% w/v of the carrier of a non-toxic alcohol. Non-alcohols useful in the said formulations include ethanol, isopropanol, stearyl alcohol, propylene glycol, polyethylene glycol and the like. Most preferred alcohol is ethanol. The cosolvent is

selected from water (page 4, lines 12-26). Essential or volatile oils such as peppermint oil, spearmint oil, menthol, etc, are added in a concentration of between about 1 and 5% w/v (page 5, lines 4-10). The said liquid compositions are formulated in a liquid spray or a liquid drop (page 6, lines 1-2). Fu et al lacks teachings on ondansetron.

Physicians' Desk Reference teaches an ondansetron hydrochloride solution for injection used as an antiemetic.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made given the general teachings of formulations for buccal mucosal administration of Fu et al, to have looked in the art for other specific active agents suitable for spray formulations of liquid carriers, as taught by Physicians' Desk Reference, with reasonable expectations of successfully preparing suitable formulations for various therapies. Furthermore it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have substituted any suitable active agent for the active agents of Fu et al's buccal spray formulations as taught by Physicians' Desk Reference.

Claims 57-62 and 89-94 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deihl (WO 9413280) in view of Fassberg et al (EP 0656206A1) and further in view of Woodley et al, Manual of Medical Therapeutics, 27<sup>th</sup> edition, 1992.

Deihl and Fassberg, discussed above, lack specific disclosure on ondansetron as the active agent and on its use with dexamethasone.

Woodley et al teaches medical management of malignant diseases which includes recommendations for antiemetic therapy. Table 19-2 lists these treatments. Ondansetron with a steroid is one of the highly recommended therapies. Steroid of choice is also disclosed as dexamethasone, 10-30 mg IV prior to chemotherapy. Ondansetron is also recommended as a dose of 0.15 mg/kg IV 30 minutes pre-chemotherapy and every 4 hours for 2 days, if needed.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have implemented the teachings of Woodley et al on treating emesis caused by chemotherapy with the formulations of the combined references for buccal administration of a solution of ondansetron with the reasonable expectations of successfully preparing and administering a safe and easy to deliver formulation to treat patients who need such treatments.

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

Art Unit: 1616

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 2 and 23 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 2 of U.S. Patent No. 6,676,931. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claims are anticipated by the reference claims. In other words, claims 2 and 23 are generic to all that is recited in claim 2 of U.S. Patent No. 6,676,931. Specifically, the buccal spray composition comprising ondansetron and a polar solvent recited in claims of instant Application are anticipated by the composition recited in claim 2 of U.S. Patent No. 6,676,931.

Art Unit: 1616

Claims 1-10, 22-28 and 40-48 are provisionally rejected on the grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 84-85, 2-7, 12, 19, 45, 50 and 57-59 of co-pending Application No. 10/230,085. The double patenting rejection is proper because the examined claims and the reference claims are substantially the same. The difference is that claims of the co-pending Application '059 recite a broader scope of active agents which includes anti-emetics such as ondansetron. Thus the instant claims are anticipated by the reference claims.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Claims 1-10, 22-28 and 40-48 are provisionally rejected on the grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 27-34, 54-59 and 80-82 of co-pending Application No. 09/537,118. The double patenting rejection is proper because the examined claims and the reference claims are substantially the same. The difference is that claims of the co-pending Application '118 recite a broader scope of active agents which includes anti-emetics such as ondansetron. Thus the instant claims are anticipated by the reference claims.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Claims 57-62 and 89-94 are provisionally rejected on the grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 27-34, 54-59 and 80-82 of co-pending Application No. 09/537,118 in view of Woodley et al, Manual of Medical Therapeutics, 27<sup>th</sup> edition, 1992. The double patenting rejection is proper

because the examined claims and the reference claims are substantially the same. The difference is that claims of the co-pending Application '118 do not recite treating emesis with a steroid and does not recite a time frame for therapy. However, Woodley et al teaches ondansetron in conjunction with dexamethasone being a recommended therapy and discloses the suitable time of therapy as well. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have implemented teachings of Woodley et al with the formulations and method of administration as claimed in the co-pending Application '118.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

***Pertinent Art***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

1) Oguri et al (JP 02-026661) teaches formulations for aerosol delivery comprising an active agent and a liquid carrier. Suitable active agents include analgesics and carrier formulations include polar and non-polar solvents and other agents. Carrier formulations may comprise a mixture of a polar and a non-polar solvent. Polar solvents include water, alcohols such as ethyl alcohol, propylene glycols. Non-polar solvents include hydrocarbons or halogenated hydrocarbons are suitable. Menthol is one of flavors used.

2) Kim (6,143,329) teaches aqueous-based pharmaceutical compositions comprising an active agent such as triamcinolone, purified water, Polysorbate and

dextrose (see example 1). The said formulations are placed in a spray bottle for delivery to the surface of mucosa.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mina Haghightian whose telephone number is 571-272-0615. The examiner can normally be reached on core office hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Johann Richter can be reached on 571-272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mina Haghightian  
May 12, 2006



Johann Richter, Ph.D. Esq.  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 1600